

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are all the claims pending in the application.

Preliminary Matters

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the Telephone interviews conducted on December 19, 2007 and December 27, 2007.

Objections to Drawings

The Examiner has objected to Fig. 2 because the interference t_a is depicted at point 10, but is described as being the interference at the maximum displacement point 11. Applicants respectfully submit that the point of maximum displacement is defined as “in the area of 25% or less of the width of the bottom 2 of the bead core with the third base point 10 as the center of the area”. *See* page 7, lines 12 and 13. Therefore, the interference t_a at the point of maximum displacement may occur anywhere within the defined range. As drawn in Fig. 2, the interference at point 10 and the interference at point 11 are shown to be equal. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit it is not improper to show t_a at point 10 in Fig. 2.

After the Applicants’ position was explained to the Examiner in the Telephone interviews, the Examiner asserted that it was his interpretation that the maximum displacement would always occur at point 10 and only occur at point 11 when the angle of the rim and the angle of the bead base are equal. However, Applicants’ representative explained that point 11 is shown to the left of point 10 but could in fact be located to the right of point 10, because the point of maximum displacement is defined as being “in the area of 25% or less of the width of the bottom 2 of the bead core with the third base point 10 as the center of the area”. *See* page 7,

lines 12 and 13. Since the third base point 10 is defined "as the center of the area", the maximum displacement may be to the left or to the right of point 10.

However, the Examiner maintains that an interference cannot be measured to the right of point 10 because point 10 marks the right most corner of the bottom of the bead core. The Examiner maintains that the interference cannot be measure to the right of point 10 because to the right of point 10 the bead base is no longer beneath the bottom of the bead core. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has misconstrued the definition of "interference".

The specification states "[t]he term 'interference' refers to a difference in distances between the bottom of the bead core and the bead base along the tire radial direction measured before and after mounting the bead portion on the rim." See page 3, lines 30-33. In other words, the "interference" is defined as the difference in radial distance between the bottom of the bead core and the bead base measured before and after mounting. There is no limitation that the interference be measured directly beneath the bead core. Specific support regarding the interference can be found in the specification and figures. For example, FIG. 2 depicts the interference "t" at the innermost end of the bead base (bead toe 5). This indicates that the interference is not measured directly beneath the bead core but measured at the area which is not beneath the bead core. Additionally, in lines 3-4 of page 6 (paragraph [0020]), it is described that "The rubber element of the bead portion 101 is pressed by the bead seat BS of the rim R to be compressively deformed", and three arrows, which represent the compressive deformation of the bead portion, are shown across the bead base 106 in FIG 4. The compressive deformation represented by the arrows corresponds to the interference and can be maximized in any place located to the right of point 10. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the interference

can be measured both to the right and to the left of point 10 and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his objection to Fig. 2.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In his rejection, the Examiner acknowledged that the claims define a maximum displacement point as being the point at which the “interference” is maximum. The Examiner also acknowledged that the term “interference” is defined as “the difference in distances between the bottom of the bead core and the bead base along the tire radial direction measured before and after mounting the tire.” The Examiner also acknowledged that in Fig. 2 of the present application t_a , t_b , and t_c are used to define interference values. However, the Examiner asserted that those values do not represent distances between the bottom of the bead core and the bead base.

After discussing this rejection with the Examiner in the Phone interview of December 19, 2007, Applicants discovered that the Examiner interpreted the definition of the “interference” to be the distance between the bottom of the bead core and the bead base. Applicants’ representative explained to the Examiner that the “interference” is “the difference in distance between the bead core and bead base before and after mounting the tire.” In other words, the “interference” represents the portion of the tire which is compressed by the tire rim when the tire is mounted. The Examiner agreed that t_a , t_b , and t_c do represent interference values as defined in the present application. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880 via EFS payment screen. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven M. Gruskin
Registration No. 36,818

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 23, 2008